

Missoula County Public Schools

Title I Standing Committee

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

6:00 to 7:30 PM

Administration Building, 215 South Sixth Street West, Room 24



Forward Thinking, High Achieving.

Attendees: Tara Barba, Brian Bessette, Heather Davis Schmidt, Brian Fortmann, Lori Grant, Terry Jarvis, Sindie Kennedy, Tracy Ledyard, Wendy Melvin, Matt Quinlan, Julie Robitaille and Shannan Sproull.

Guiding Question:

How do we assure the MCPS Title I program best meets the needs of students and families?

Long term target:

Align Title I goals, programming and budgets to the Federal requirements, MCPS district, Graduation Matters and 21st Century Model of Education goals.

Short term targets:

- Review Community Advisory Committee purpose
- Review collective commitments for collaborative work
- Review revised Feeder Pattern Data, using open enrollment data analysis
- Review revised draft 2014-15 high school budget

AGENDA

6:00 – 6:05	Welcome and dinner
6:05 – 6:10	<p>Review agenda, Community Advisory Committee purpose and Collective Commitments for Collaborative Work</p> <p>Heather welcomed everyone. She reviewed the agenda, the long term and short term targets, Collective Commitments for Collaborative Work.</p>
6:10 – 6:30	<p>Review revised Feeder Pattern data, using open enrollment data analysis; Review revised draft 2014-15 high school budget – Heather Davis Schmidt</p> <p>Heather explained she gathered and analyzed feeder pattern data. She presented the data to B.J. Granberry and Jack O'Connor at OPI. They approved the data analysis.</p> <p>Heather explained the data includes a column for Total K-8 enrollment that includes enrollment for each feeder school. The column for Low Income is not</p>

labeled as Free & Reduced Meals data. This column is labeled Poverty Data as it is reflected differently by different schools (e.g., Woodman school doesn't have a meals program).

The data becomes less straight forward when we look at MCPS K-5 enrollment. Our K-5 feeder schools do not directly feed into a single middle or high school like those schools outside of our K-8 district (e.g., Bonner to Hellgate).

Franklin geocodes feed into all three high schools. Paxson feeds into two different high schools. Russell feeds into two different high schools.

The Actual MCPS High School Low Income data has nothing to do with the outcomes. This data is included because it might be of interest to the committee. The theory has been that low income students attend the schools in their geocode. This was not the case, as this data reflects.

Heather explained the Free & Reduced Meals data is a projection based on the number of students who currently attending Big Sky High School from a feeder school (e.g. 6.5% of Bonner students are currently attending BSHS). Heather explained how she came up with the percentage based on actual enrollment - she analyzed the data based on existing enrollment at the feeder schools and made projections. Tony Zook had to write a report to correlate the geocodes with F&R meals data.

When we consider feeder school data, it raises the high school poverty rate. By federal law, we have to serve all schools if 75% or more of their students are eligible for Free & Reduced Meals. We can choose to serve all schools if 35% of their students are eligible for Free & Reduced Meals. Sentinel is actually above that 35% threshold. We don't serve all K-8 schools that exceed 35%.

Heather explained the middle school feeder pattern data. She pointed out that Meadow Hill is at 50.5% when considering feeder school data. This is significantly higher than the data reflects with just Free & Reduced Meals data.

Heather explained any existing Title I school that is above 40% can apply for schoolwide status. This will not mean more Title I money to the district; it will mean distributing the funding differently.

Heather asked the group to provide feedback on the Feeder Pattern data.

Julie Robitaille wondered about the out-of-district students that attend group

homes. How are they included in the count? Julie explained DPHHS is paying tuition for a lot of students that reside in group homes outside the district boundary.

Brian Bessette felt the data was fairly accurate. He felt it was more accurate than the other model, even though it is a projection.

Brian Fortmann agreed with Brian Bessette's comment.

Shannan Sproull explained there are a lot of students that don't complete the forms so the Feeder Pattern data seems accurate.

Wendy felt this adds pressure to the elementary schools to make sure they are getting the forms completed. Franklin's numbers dipped last year. This was likely an anomaly.

Shannan wondered if a one-year anomaly would have an impact.

Matt Quinlan was very happy with the data. He felt it provided an accurate picture - more so than the original feeder model and the F&R Meals application model.

Terry Jarvis was excited that we have worked so hard for the past two years. It has been rewarding to make it to this point. We don't have to re-invent the wheel. We knew the F&R Meals application process was not the best strategy. She thanked Heather for all of your hard work.

Tracy Ledyard agreed with everything and thanked Heather for her hard work. Tracy was happy we were not going to have to re-consider a model every year. She felt we needed to continue to collect F&R Meals applications.

Heather explained we would continue to collect forms. We will make comparisons. We will continue to share targeting reports monthly.

Tracy suggested more people enter poverty than exit poverty.

Julie explained she agreed that the F&R Meals application was the way to go at the K-5 level. She agreed that it was a more accurate way of looking at data at the high school level. She wanted to know more about how out-of-district kids impact data.

Heather explained we are only looking at funding high schools next year with this data. We are not considering middle school for next year, but we will want to consider middle school for the future.

Heather stressed that we do not want to establish a poverty percentage of where we will fund schools. We absolutely have to fund schools above 75%.

Wendy Melvin suggested we continue to look at both F&R Meals data and feeder school data at the middle school level for the next two years to see if patterns emerge.

Terry agreed with everyone's comments.

Lori Grant thanked Heather for putting this data together. She thought it looked good for high school. She wondered about the middle school average. She understood we could not establish a cutoff except the 75% requirement. She thought it would be nice to establish a threshold. Lori wondered if we could project out to 5 years. Heather explained this data reflects a snapshot on a specific day of enrollment. We do have five year data that shows open enrollment is working well because we have students going to different schools other than their geocode reflects.

Sindie explained that Heather followed the federal guidelines on how to accurately calculate feeder school data. As such, the data is analyzed properly. She stressed the federal guideline also indicate that collecting and analyzing this data should not be cumbersome. If it is cumbersome, a different methodology should be used. Based on the amount of time Heather spent on analyzing this data, it was cumbersome. Next year will be a true test on the feasibility of using feeder school data. Heather developed a solid template that should only require adding new numbers. All of the formulas are in place for making the proper calculations. Tony Zook also spent a lot of time gathering the data. He was able to write a report that should make the process quick and easy next year.

The piece that Heather wanted to verify with OPI more than anything was the use of bands of poverty. Last year, we were told we could not use the feeder pattern model and use bands of poverty. We learned from OPI that we could use feeder pattern and bands of poverty. We learned how to do this on eGrants.

Last year, we had to use the same per pupil amount for all schools. This cut Seeley's allocation in half.

By allocating funding based on bands of poverty, we can direct more funding to

	<p>the school with the highest poverty. Heather showed two previous years of allocation comparisons. Last year, we were not able to use bands of poverty so having two years to compare with is helpful.</p> <p>Heather reminded everyone that we received a cut last year and we received a cut this year to our total allocation.</p> <p>Tracy asked why there is a difference between Hellgate and Big Sky in terms of per pupil amount when the difference in poverty is small. Heather explained the difference in funding is not significant between Big Sky and Hellgate. Heather explained we can choose to fund every school at the same per pupil amount.</p>
6:30 – 7:00	<p>Discuss structure of Title I Community Advisory Committee – Heather Davis Schmidt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has worked well with the Title I Community Advisory Committee? • What could we do differently with the Title I Community Advisory Committee? • How should we rotate committee membership? • How should we maintain a representative membership from Title I and non-Title I buildings? <p>What has worked well? Broad representation from K-12, staff members, parents and administrators, voices are heard, having David Rott on the committee because he was a neutral party. Heather appreciates that we have this committee. It is not required and it is not something we have had before. She appreciates that everyone was willing to participate. Food is an incentive to be here. It is a good platform for discussion for getting other people's perspectives and ideas. The committee members appreciate Heather's hard work.</p> <p>What could we do differently? Because Paxson keeps coming up, it would be nice to have representation on the committee from Paxson. Meadow Hill should be here too. Streamline the name – be consistent (it is different on the wiki). The committee is advising Heather not the board. Heather has some ability to share advice from the committee to the board. Heather feels she wouldn't have accomplished what we accomplished if not for this committee. Not having a data manager hurt us - it held us back. We spent so much time talking about budgets, we never got to discussions about Title I programming. Heather explained having the data piece resolved will allow us to move on to discussing programming – to gauge how we can get the most from our funding.</p> <p>Heather envisions this group problem-solving before programming and funding decisions are shared publicly. Because we didn't have the Feeder Pattern conversation early enough, the issue was raised at the Meeting of Practitioners.</p>

	<p>We needed to have the conversation as a committee first before getting to the Meeting of Practitioners. Tracy didn't feel there was an opportunity to have the conversation here. Heather wondered if we need to modify the collective commitment to include the opportunity for strong feelings to be voiced. Perhaps include time on the agenda for new business and burning issues. Heather reported there is discussion at the federal level on providing more funding for Title I and early childhood. This could have a positive outcome on Title I someday in the near future.</p> <p>Rotating Committee Membership - Heather asked if committee members want to continue. Terry Jarvis will move off the committee and Julie will assign a Title I teacher. Julie Robitaille will also be on the committee next year. Brian Bessette wants to stay. Wendy Melvin wants to stay. Lori Grant is leaving us to teach 5th grade at Paxson. Heather will ask another instructional coach to join the committee. Tracy Ledyard would not feel comfortable being on the committee because of program discussions. Heather explained we have a lot of programming that is not just decision-making at the principal level. Tracy wants to talk with her principal first and get a sense of her vision before committing. Heather is hoping to present some research on best practices at the Meeting of Practitioners. We may want to have two Meeting of Practitioners each year. Principals do have an important decision-making role. Brian Fortmann won't be on the committee next year. An administrator from Big Sky should be here. Shannan Sproull won't be here. Perhaps a counselor from a non-Title I school could join the committee. We need a parent representative from a middle school, elementary and high school. It would be nice to have a representative from Seeley, but no one wants to do the drive. We could do a phone or video conference with a Seeley-Swan representative. We want an FRC coordinator from an elementary and middle school. Erica Ramsey from Porter and Leslie Gallant from Lowell will be asked to continue (they were not present). We want non-Title I representation to include an administrator and a FIT coordinator. Do we want a Sentinel representative? Everyone agreed there is no need for a representative from Sentinel.</p> <p>Tara Barba will be leaving the committee. Her son is graduating high school this year. Tara thanked everyone. She explained it has been a good experience to be part of this committee.</p>
7:00-7:15	<p>Closing and next steps</p> <p>Next meeting date: <i>To be determined for 2014-15</i></p>